

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 6, 2007.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Claims 4-6, 8, and 10-17 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4-6, 8, and 10-17.

Claims 4-6, 8, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass (U.S. Pat. No. 6,993,774) in view of Gissel et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,051,324).

Claims 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass in view of Dattke et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0143835).

### **II. Summary of Applicants' Response**

The present Reply amends claims 8 and 10 and adds new claim 18, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 4-6, 8, and 10-18. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

### **III. Response to Rejections**

The Office Action, at page 4, paragraph 3, notes that "Glass does not specifically disclose dynamically generating a wrapper class that extends from a superclass, wherein the superclass implements Java Database Connectivity, Java Messaging Service or Java Connector Architecture." The Office Action then alleges that claim 17 is obvious over Glass in view of Gissel. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Gissel teaches the use of a J2EE JMX MBean to provide an external connection to another JVM process (e.g., a non-application process JVM) where the non-application objects are running. (Gissel, col. 6, ll 58-61.) In this way, administrative information regarding the application modules running within the JVM may be provided to the non-JVM modules and application modules may load the external classes as if the non-JVM modules were running in the same AppServer JVM. (Gissel, col. 4 ll. 37-44.) The administrative client 32 of Gissel provides interfaces to the external Classloader Tooling vendor's code 31 and is provided with connectors such as the Remote Machine Interface (RMI) connector 34 and the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) connector 33.

Applicants respectfully submit that Gissel does not teach dynamically generating a wrapper class that extends from a superclass, wherein the superclass implements Java Database Connectivity (JDBC), Java Message Service (JMS) and Java Connector Architecture (JCA) interfaces. In contrast, Gissel teaches the use of a J2EE JMX MBean to provide an external connection to another JVM process (e.g., a non-application process JVM) where the non-application objects are running. (Gissel, col. 6, ll 58-61.) In this way, administrative information regarding the application modules running within the JVM may be provided to the non-JVM modules and application modules may load the external classes as if the non-JVM modules were running in the same AppServer JVM. (Gissel, col. 4 ll. 37-44.) The administrative client 32 of Gissel provides interfaces to the external Classloader Tooling vendor's code 31 and is provided with connectors such as the Remote Machine Interface (RMI) connector 34 and the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) connector 33. Applicants respectfully disagree that the administrative client 32 correlates to a superclass, or that JMX correlates to JDBC and JMS, or that RMI correlates to JCA as per the referenced Office Action for the following reasons.

The administrative client 32 merely provides interfaces to vendor code 31. In contrast, a superclass is a class from which other classes are derived. A class is a programming language construct that is used to group related instance variables and methods. A method, called a function in some languages, is a set of instructions that are specific to a class. Depending on the language, classes may support multiple inheritances or may require the use of interfaces to extend other classes. A class may indicate either specifically or abstractly what methods exist when the program is executed. A superclass is not a mechanism to provide interfaces as is the administrative client of Gissel. As such, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner on this point.

JMX is a Java technology that supplies tools for managing and monitoring applications, system objects, devices (e.g. printers) and service oriented networks. Those resources are represented by objects called Mbeans. In contrast, JDBC is an API for the Java programming language that defines how a client may access a database. It provides methods for querying and updating data in a database. JMS API is a Java Message Oriented Middleware (MOM) API for sending messages between two or more clients. JDBC and JMS are APIs for a client to access a database or for sending a message to another client while JMX is a technology for managing and monitoring applications. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner on this point.

The RMI system allows an object running in one Java virtual machine to invoke methods on an object running in another Java virtual machine. JCA is a Java-based technology solution for connecting application servers and enterprise information systems (EIS) as part of enterprise application integration (EAI) solutions. While JDBC is specifically used to connect Java EE applications to databases, JCA is a more generic architecture for connection to legacy systems (including databases). RMI and JCA are not related in the manner in which the Office Action suggests.

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 17 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Glass and Gissel. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection to claim 17 be withdrawn. Dependent Claims 4-6, 8, and 18 depend from Claim 17. For at least the reasons discussed above with regards to Claim 17, dependent Claims 4-6, 8, and 18 are also patentable. Dependent claims 4-6, 8, and 18 add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Independent Claim 10 and dependent Claims 11-16 are also patentable for the reasons above. Independent Claim 10 and dependent claims 11-16 add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right.

#### IV. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, May 30, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 30, 2007

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/  
Thomas K. Plunkett  
Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800